

to Israel, an act Israel took for very strong security reasons but which is causing very substantial economic losses to the Palestinians.

I think the administration has done a good job there with the work of Dennis Ross, as a de facto roving ambassador, talking to the parties and trying to work through the issues. That is a matter which I think requires expedited assistance from the U.S. Government and others to try to bring those parties back to the conference table, to try to work out their problems, to try to stop the fighting and the bloodshed, and to move the peace process ahead.

While the Palestinian-Israeli problems are taking the front pages, the Syrian-Israeli problems still are very prominent, with the Syrians still undertaking military maneuvers which may threaten Israel.

I had an opportunity to discuss those issues when I was in the area last month with Syrian President Assad and also with Prime Minister Netanyahu. In fact, I carried two messages from Prime Minister Netanyahu to President Assad. One was on the subject of Israel's interest in cooling the contentiousness on the southern Lebanon border, where Prime Minister Netanyahu had publicly said that Syria would be held responsible for the Hezbollah attacks on northern Israel. President Assad's response was that those military maneuvers were not with hostile intent but were really of a routine nature. Whether that is exactly so or not, that process has to be moved forward.

Prime Minister Netanyahu asked me further to convey the message that he personally would engage in the negotiations, leaving, of course, the option to President Assad as to whether he would or would not so participate. But there again I think the administration has done a good job. I think the roving de facto ambassador, Dennis Ross, has done a good job. Those matters have to be moved forward through the negotiation process. I urge the parties to move ahead there. It is difficult, obviously, for Prime Minister Netanyahu to be handling the Palestinian controversies at the same time, and they are on the front part of the front burner, but the Syrian negotiations have to be addressed as well.

GULF WAR DRUG TESTING

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I wish to comment briefly on a report on damage to United States troops from exposure to Iraqi poison gas back in 1991 during the gulf war. This is a subject on which there was a joint hearing earlier this week, on Wednesday, of the Intelligence Committee, which I chair, and the Veterans Affairs Committee, on which I serve, chaired by Senator ALAN SIMPSON.

During the course of those hearings, we heard from the chief medical officer of the Department of Defense, Dr. Stephen C. Joseph, as well as representa-

tives from the CIA and the Veterans Administration. The views expressed by Senators on both sides of the aisle were that the Department of Defense had not done nearly enough to respond to the ailments which came out of that exposure to Iraqi chemical warfare agents.

There were those, principally Senator SIMPSON, who made the point in his customary strong way that the evidence was inconclusive, saying that people had not shown the effects of the poisonous gas immediately and that would have happened if there had really been a problem, and was in defense of the Department of Defense.

Virtually every other Senator—and I think some 14 attended, from both sides of the aisle—was very critical of what the Department of Defense had done. And perhaps no one was more critical than Senator ROCKEFELLER, the ranking Democrat, on the Veterans' Affairs Committee. He has sent a letter, which I was about to cosign but could not quite review fast enough on Thursday, over to the Pentagon and Secretary Perry asking for more action. In that letter, Senator ROCKEFELLER was very explicit about what the Department of Defense had not done in acting on the complaints of the service men and women in the area.

This morning the Washington Post has a story, page A18, which I will ask to be made a part of the RECORD as if read in full, which is headlined "Pentagon Alters Stand on Gulf War Testing." The second paragraph—almost completely reversing comments made at a Pentagon briefing Thursday, that is, the day after our hearing—says that our troops were not told the drug was being used on an investigational basis and might have side effects, but said that information was not deliberately withheld from them.

Mr. President, it is a little hard at this stage to say that where you have withheld some key facts, it was not deliberate. After all, why wouldn't people on whom the drug was being used on an investigational basis be told? How can you say it is not deliberate if you do not tell people that they are, in effect, guinea pigs or not tell them that it might have side effects. Any person is entitled as a matter of fundamental fairness to know that. How can you subject someone to a drug testing without them being told that? It is more than a little incomprehensible.

The article then goes on to say: "On Capitol Hill, Senator JOHN D. 'JAY' ROCKEFELLER called on Defense Secretary William J. Perry to fire the Pentagon's top health official."

Saying that the Department of Defense had squandered its credibility, which is a conclusion reached by the staff of a Presidential commission which I brought out at last Wednesday's hearing.

Then the article concludes by noting that Secretary of Defense Perry and Deputy Secretary of Defense John D. White "continue to have the full and

utmost confidence" in the health leadership at the Department of Defense and that no "health changes" in "health leadership are being contemplated."

That, of course, again is a little surprising in the context that Secretary Perry could not conceivably have had an opportunity to review the Senate hearing since he has been at a NATO meeting. And when we have a hearing like that and many Senators are present and express themselves and facts are brought out, one would at least think that the Secretary of Defense would review the matter, or the Deputy Secretary also could not have had an opportunity to go through the complex matters which were raised at that time.

I ask unanimous consent a copy of this Washington Post article be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 28, 1996]
PENTAGON ALTERS STAND ON GULF WAR DRUG TESTING

The Defense Department said yesterday it did not deliberately withhold information from U.S. troops in the 1991 Persian Gulf War on an anti-nerve gas drug to keep Iraq from learning about U.S. defenses.

Almost completely reversing comments made at a Pentagon briefing Thursday, it said troops were not told the drug was being used on an investigational basis and might have side effects but said that information was not deliberately withheld from them.

Researchers are studying whether the drug, pyridostigmine bromide (PB), in combination with chemicals in the Gulf War, might be one cause for illnesses among thousands of veterans.

On Capitol Hill, Sen. John D. "Jay" Rockefeller IV (W.Va.), called on Defense Secretary William J. Perry to fire the Pentagon's top health official. Rockefeller, the ranking Democrat on the Senate Veterans Affairs Committee, told Perry in a letter that the Pentagon has "squandered its credibility" on the issue of Gulf War illness.

The senator did not name a specific official in his letter. But a spokeswoman for Rockefeller, Laura Quinn, said he was referring to Stephen C. Joseph, the Pentagon's assistant secretary for health affairs.

Perry has been attending a NATO meeting in Norway, but a spokesman said both Perry and Deputy Defense Secretary John D. White "continue to have the full and utmost confidence" in Joseph and that "no changes" in "health leadership are being contemplated."

Mr. SPECTER. Finally, I now turn to the introduction of legislation. I ask this be under a separate heading in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COVERDELL). The Chair will advise the Senator from Pennsylvania that his time has expired.

Mr. SPECTER. I ask unanimous consent for 3 additional minutes, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, following the remarks of the Senator from Pennsylvania, I be recognized for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Texas for yielding me the additional 3 minutes. She had been presiding and has been waiting now to speak, and I will conclude briefly.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

MR. SPECTER. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. SPECTER pertaining to the introduction of S. 2154 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under a previous unanimous-consent agreement, the Chair now recognizes the Senator from Texas.

THE CONTINUING RESOLUTION

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I rise today with a sense of both joy and disappointment as I am being briefed by my staff about what is the purported agreement for the continuing resolution that will fund our country for the next year. There are, indeed, some very good parts of that bill. But I have to say that the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, Senator GREGG, made a compelling speech this morning about many of the fine points of this bill that are atrocious, and talking about dealing with the administration, the administration which changed the negotiating points constantly throughout this process. I think it is a sad way that we are going to end this session, that the administration has come in at virtually the last hour and held the threat of shutting down Government and blaming the Republican Congress for doing it, in an effort to win things that have been lost on the floor already.

So, it is with mixed feelings that I rise to talk about what is in this bill, both good and bad. I am very pleased that we are going to satisfy the basic responsibilities that we must. We are going to support our troops in the Middle East and in Bosnia. But we are going to do it with \$1 billion less than we had hoped we could have in our defense budget because this is not a safe world. As we were sending troops into the Middle East—because in many ways it looks as if we did not have a clear policy on the Kurds, but nevertheless we sent troops in to reinforce—as we were doing it, the administration was asking us to cut the defense budget. We are going to be able to do the basic things that we need to do, but we are not making the plans for the future that we must make for our country to be secure from incoming ballistic missiles, in theaters, wherever our forces may be, to be secure from incoming ballistic missiles. We are not doing what we ought to be doing to plan for the future strength of our military so we will remain ready for any contingencies that might occur.

We are not planning as we should. I hope that next year, when the elections are over, we will be able to commit the amount of money and resources we need, first, to make sure that America stays secure and strong and, second, that we will protect our troops from disasters like the bombing that we saw just a few months ago in Saudi Arabia.

We are going to give pay raises to our young men and women in the military, who so richly deserve them, 3 percent pay raises. That is a good part of this bill. But we are not planning enough for their future with ballistic missile defenses and other major pieces of equipment and technologies that would look to the future so an incoming ballistic missile can be stopped before it goes into its downward track.

Mr. President, we are going to increase with this bill funding for breast cancer research, a long time coming. Women's diseases in this country have been made short shrift by Congresses of the past, but not in this Congress. This Congress has increased funding for breast cancer research and osteoporosis research, diseases that particularly afflict women in our country, and I am proud that we are doing that.

We are going to more fairly distribute the money for Amtrak in our country. I fought hard for that, and I appreciate the fact that all of us came together on a bipartisan basis to strengthen Amtrak for our country and to give all of the States that were told 2 months ago they would lose their service of Amtrak, including my State of Texas, but many States across the western part of our country.

We were told that we would have 90 days and these routes would be gone. Mr. President, 90 days is not enough for a State to be able to come in and add funding, resources to keep lines like this open. You have to have better planning. Most States have biennial legislatures. My State certainly does, and I wanted a 6-month extension to give all of us a chance to see if the States can come up with a better plan to help keep Amtrak service in our States, because I believe in a balanced transportation system, and I believe Amtrak is a major part of that.

Because I like the idea that we can have a bus feeder system into Amtrak stations so that people who do not have the mobility that many in our urban areas have will have access from the small communities of our country into the Amtrak stations, into our cities and our mass transit systems, and into our airports. That is what Amtrak can be if we can get a good system for Amtrak where the States and the Federal Government come together. So this bill does fund a 6-month extension for those important Amtrak lines that were told that they would close.

We are going to increase funding for medical research, including AIDS. AIDS is an epidemic in this country, and it is time that we realize it is hitting children, babies, as well as people from all walks of life. It is a tragedy,

and we should be increasing our commitment to finding out what causes this deadly virus so that we can do something to save the lives of innocent people, and we are doing that.

We are putting major resources into antiterrorism measures and also drug interdiction.

Mr. President, we have been hearing just recently in the last 6 months about incredible statistics showing that drug abuse is now going back up among our teenagers and, even worse, Mr. President, under teenagers—under teenagers. Our children, starting at the age of 9, are abusing drugs in this country. This is a crime, it is a disease, and we must get rid of it. So our bill will put the resources into that.

But I am very concerned about the illegal immigration bill and what the administration did in negotiating that bill. That bill passed this body months ago. We had a strong bipartisan effort for a bill that does give us the tools to stop illegal immigration into our country that costs our taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars. It was told to us that the bipartisan bill would be signed. It was told to us by the President that he would sign the bill. Yet, after that representation was made, he came in with the threat that he would shut down Government and blame the Republicans for it and reopen the illegal immigration bill that had bipartisan support in this Congress.

It appears that that bill has been changed and some of the key provisions have been taken out, such that a person on welfare would be able to bring other immigrants into this country and supposedly vouch that they would not become dependent on taxpayer resources. A person who is dependent on taxpayer resources saying that they will support another person coming into our country and that they will not be supported by taxpayer resources, how naive can we be?

Mr. President, I am hoping that this Senate will be able to vote on a bill, that we have already passed in both Houses of Congress, on Monday that will put those key provisions back in to the illegal immigration bill so that we will have teeth in it and we will protect the taxpayers from people who would come to this country with their hand out rather than coming to this country in the spirit and tradition of the legal immigrants looking for the opportunity to do better for themselves and for this country.

I am very concerned that we would renegotiate the bill on illegal immigration that gives us the chance, finally, to say it means something to be a legal immigrant in this country, because if you come in illegally, there will be a price to pay and that price is that you will not be able to come into our country and seek citizenship for 10 years if you have broken the laws of our country by entering illegally.

I hope that we can pass the illegal immigration bill in its entirety on Monday and that we will not succumb